

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Billy Roy Boyd,	)	C/A No.: 6:17-1032-TLW-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	ORDER
Alan Wilson; W. Walter Wilkins; Scott	)	
D. Robinson; and R. Mills Ariail, Jr.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights by Alan Wilson (“Wilson”), W. Walter Wilkins (“Wilkins”), Scott D. Robinson (“Robinson”), and R. Mills Ariail, Jr. (“Ariail”). [ECF No. 1]. Robinson and Wilkins filed separate motions to dismiss on October 14, 2017, and October 26, 2017, respectively. [ECF Nos. 43, 46]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered orders pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), on October 16, 2017, and October 26, 2017, advising him of the importance of the motions and of the need for him to file adequate responses by November 16, 2017, and November 27, 2017, respectively. [ECF Nos. 44, 47]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the motions may be granted.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court’s *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motions of Robinson and Wilkins. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motions and wishes to

abandon this action.<sup>1</sup> Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to all pending motions to dismiss by December 15, 2017. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, the undersigned will recommend that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



December 1, 2017  
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed a motion to amend his complaint on August 30, 2017. [ECF No. 38]. The motion to amend does not relieve Plaintiff of his responsibility to file responses to the motions. Additionally, Plaintiff previously failed to respond to the motions to dismiss filed by Wilson and Ariail.